

justly—individually—by convention—by the press—by the voice. In every way which Northern feeling ever finds utterance, let it now be heard, like the sound of many mingling waters. Let it not be an uncertain sound. Let there be no "if" to act as a peace-maker between truth and a lie—no "but."

"Which is a jailer to bring forth
Some monstrous malefactor."

Let every voice that speaks, say to the South as one—*"We will abolish Slavery in our measure immediately. We will not hold slaves with you another hour!"* Then those who look upon our nation crying, *"pro perpetuo"*—will have their heart's desire. Whoso, in this field of right, sows in despair, shall reap a glorious harvest. Whoso loseth his life shall find it. Whoso dissolves his union with slaveholders, shall in that same proportion, preserve these States united and safe. There is but one danger to our country or to ourselves—falsehood to our free principles. If even so few as we, continue faithful to these, the basis only of our Union will be changed—from Slavery to Freedom,—while the Union itself will be more strongly cemented than it has ever before been. To this work we would devote ourselves, though we alone should be left to carry it forward.

But we are not alone. The spirits of the good and great of all ages are round about our humble band. The souls of those who have left this world to us in solemn testament of death, are evermore strengthening our weakness. To this end was the world made, that all men should be free; and therefore the success of the American Anti-Slavery Society is sure.

From the Providence Gazette. Gov. Dorr released!

We stop the press to announce the fact that the bill before the Legislature for the liberation of Governor Dorr, and for a general amnesty, as given in our legislative proceedings, was passed into a law yesterday morning, June 25th.

The news, together with an authenticated copy of the act, was brought to this city yesterday at half past six o'clock, and was immediately carried over to the prison by Walter S. Burges, who took with him a carriage to receive Gov. Dorr, and convey him from the loathsome scene of his wrongs and sufferings, who is now, at 3 1/2 o'clock, making preparations to quit the prison. Hundreds of citizens are crowding the prison door and hundreds more, in carriages, on horseback and on foot, are thronging the roads leading to that hated place, to get a glimpse of this victim of persecution and once more welcome him on his restoration to his friends, the people and to the world.

He comes forth, not restored to his civil rights, but he comes to receive a joyful welcome, and the deepest sympathy and the warmest reception, from a people, who highly appreciate his public services and noble sacrifices in their behalf. The citizens are animated by a warm and generous enthusiasm by this event, but the most commendable tranquillity prevails in the city.

The loud booming of the cannon from Smith's and Federal Hills, and the waving of the flags from the hickory pole and flag staves, give unequivocal tokens of the general and undisguised joy which pervades all ranks and sexes in the city. Gov. Dorr is now restored to his liberty, and the people are rejoicing with exceeding great joy.

Correspondence.

From the Liberty Herald.

JEFFERSON, July 5, 1845.

MR. TAIT, Dear Sir:—We have had another treat in the exhibition of Abby Kelley and her associates, who have been here a couple of days, under the wing of Mr. Giddings, preaching Dissolution.

There are some facts connected with this matter, which go to enrich the exhibition, and show up some of the performers to admiration.

It appears that Mr. J. R. Giddings, Hon. perhaps I ought to say, has been in correspondence with our friend Abby, and by written communications passing between the two, it was agreed that Miss Kelley should get in ahead of the meetings of the Ohio Anti-Slavery Society, with a view as is well known, of forestalling public opinion, and creating a prejudice against the liberty-loving part of the abolitionists. The result shows that there was another compact entered into between these anti-compromisers, which seems to be no less than that Giddings on his part, agrees to endorse the sentiments of Madam Kelley, Disunion, on condition that she should praise the whig party and call Mr. Giddings a great man. The way that scene opens is rich in the extreme. The Hero of the wash tub, as she calls herself, led off, and fulfilled to the letter her part of the undertaking, praising the whigs and extolling Giddings, and then called upon Mr. Giddings to fulfil his part of the compact. But it appears that Giddings understood the contract to be that he was to give his silent, dignified approbation of her course—that an Hon. was only to stand by and look on approvingly, without any public pledge of his adherence to any specific point from which he could not back out if necessary, and come out upon some other tack. But Abby would not thus be trifled with. She laid down her positions that the Government was conceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity. That the Constitution of the United States was a pro-slavery document. That each and every person swearing to support or voting under that Constitution, was bound by his oath to support the system of slavery. That the only means of abolishing slavery was a Dissolution of the Union—or an annihilation of the Federal Government—and then called upon Mr. Giddings to give in public his assent or dissent to each of her propositions. Mr. G. manifested extreme reluctance to commit himself and, had it not been that the whole assembly seconded her call, and demanded of him the fulfillment of his pledge, he would have dodged the question, and come off with flying colors on whichever side of the fence he might have thought most convenient, or best calculated to give him \$5 per day and travelling expenses the longest period of time. Mr. Giddings took the stand and said: "In what the Lady has said I find no point on which I can disagree. I have heard no sentiment to which I would not respond Amen."

But—Giddings was in trouble, it was a cause

for divorce from his living spouse, that she should indict the extreme cruelty upon him of calling him out on that occasion, and it was necessary that some mental preservation should be made in favor of his own dear \$5 per day and travelling expenses, and that came up in the form of a promise that he would reconsider the constitutional question, not of slavery, for of that he was satisfied, but of his ability to adopt the non-resistant principles and dissolution measures of Abby Kelley and escape the imputation of perjury which she had been lavishing upon all who had the hardihood to cast a vote under the Constitution, and still call themselves abolitionists. It was a rich specimen of woman's inhumanity to man, to see Giddings standing under the pulpit, piously calling upon God to witness his sincerity, while he was writhing under the infliction of the penalty of his compromise, and striving to work in some saving clause in such a manner as to still retain his seat in Congress—all that was wanting to make the whole farce complete, was a pocket full of Giddings' Garland Forgeries, of the truth of which he had evidence last fall as strong as any evidence of the truth of Holy writ.

You may hear from me again.

Yours,

A. BAGLEY.

From the Liberty Herald.

MR. TAIT, Sir:—Your Herald of last week has just fallen under my eye. It contains a tissue of the most base and impudent falsehoods, over the signature "A. Bagley." It is not my custom to make any reply to newspaper squibs, slanders, misrepresentations or ridicule; but in this one instance I depart from my wonted course. Not that I design to defend Mr. Giddings' reputation or my own. Mr. G.'s character is sufficiently well understood in this, his own neighborhood. As for myself, if I am as faithful to the truth as he whom I desire to follow, I shall, like him, be without reputation. My object is to call on the public to brand the writer of the article to which I refer, as utterly destitute of common honesty, and never again to be trusted, till he shall have lived a long life of repentance. I know not who that writer is, whether man, woman or child, I presume it is not a child, as there is a hardness of lying about it, which no child, I think, could have acquired. For the honor of my sex, I trust it is not a woman, and I therefore use the masculine pronoun in referring to the writer.

He speaks with the coolest assurance of an agreement between Mr. Giddings and myself, as to the holding of meetings with a view to frustrating public opinion, and creating prejudice against the liberty-loving party of the abolitionists. Mr. G. had nothing to do with fixing the time of our meetings, and knew nothing of our appointments till we wrote him a request, that he would see that they were notified. In the letter making this request, we distinctly stated to him, that, although we did not agree with him as to measures, yet, as he was an abolitionist, as well as a friend of free discussion, we presumed he would so far aid us as to give our notices. Indeed, we wrote to him, only as we did to Mr. Hutchins, in relation to our Warren meeting, and there was quite as much agreement between Mr. H. and myself to thwart the whigs and aid the Liberty party, as there was between Mr. G. and myself to thwart the Liberty party and aid whigism.

But there is something exceedingly rich in the bold and deliberate manner of stating another falsehood when he says Mr. Giddings agrees to "endorse my sentiments on disunion, if I would praise the whigs and call Mr. G. a great man." I have heard of falsehoods made out of whole cloth, but this is made of no cloth at all. It must have sprung from the foulest place in a terribly foul brain.

But I will proceed no farther. The article is all of a piece, and too filthy for dissection. That its author may be speedily brought to repentance, is the sincere and earnest prayer of

Yours for veracity,

ABBY KELLEY.

P. S. A word of comment on your editorial of last week, which has my name for its caption. Why did you not, as requested, publish the note sent you, not at my suggestion, but by Mr. Jones? That would have corrected your misrepresentations, and saved you a long article of further misrepresentations. Do you not dare allow free discussion?

I now again state, that the American Anti-Slavery Society is no more opposed to human governments, than is the Presbyterian Church or the Liberty Party. It opposes no governments but those which support Slavery. As to my individual opinions on religions or governments, I do not conceive that they have any business in the meetings of that Society, but as you misrepresent me in your paper, I will make the correction. I am not opposed to any human government that does not contravene the government of God.

A. KELLEY.

THE BUGLE.

NEW-LISBON, AUGUST 1, 1845.

"I love agitation when there is cause for it—the alarm-bell which startles the inhabitants of a city, saves them from being burned in their beds."—Edmund Burke.

Dr. Bailly and Comeouterism.

We perceive by the Philanthropist of July 9th, that Dr. Bailly has dissolved his connection with the Methodist Protestant church.

We have respect for the man who leaves his popular pro-slavery party, and tells his Whig or Democratic brethren that their practice gives the lie to their profession, and that he considers membership in their party derogatory to the character of a freeman. We have more respect—because the sacrifice is greater—for the man who forsakes his religious sect as a testimony against its pro-slavery character, and tells the brethren whom he has left behind, that they are false to their trust, recreant to their duty, and that their association is unworthy the name of a christian church.

We supposed from the prominent position Dr. Bailly occupies as a Liberty party man, that he left his former party in the manner above mentioned—if so, we

commend him for it. His coming out from the church was, however done in a very different way from that to which we have briefly referred. We did not expect better of him; for the man who belongs to a party which places politics higher than religion, or in other words, requires a more perfect standard of morality from the politician than the religionist, will not be likely to deal very harshly with the church however corrupt it may be. But perhaps in this matter of politics, we have heretofore given the Dr. more than his due; for he says "we assume not to pronounce judgment upon those who deem continued adhesion (to sect or party) best upon the whole." This is his profession, but what is his practice as a member of the Liberty party? Does not that, with its multiplicity of machinery continually condemn adhesion to the other parties? Will not Whigs and Democrats scornfully laugh at the Doctor's assertion that he does not condemn them?

In his letter of resignation he informs the church, that although it is gravely delinquent on the subject of slavery, and holds a peculiar connection with the evil; that although the great majority of its members neglect the duty of sympathizing with those in bonds as bound with them, yet he "does not question the christian character of its membership." If we rightly understand this, it is a very polite way of saying "you are a parcel of hypocrites, but quite an honest set of fellows after all."

The Dr. is identified with Liberty Party, is acknowledged as one of its leaders in Ohio. That party says you must support no man for office who is in connection with either the Whig or Democratic parties. They ought not to be trusted so long as they remain in that connection. The Dr. in his reply to the letter of Edward Smith, speaking of the connection of Liberty party men with pro-slavery churches says:—

"It is true that the leaders of the Liberty party in Cincinnati are connected with Churches which have not adopted anti-slavery ground; but the man who should say that this circumstance has ever abated their zeal in the cause of freedom, restrained or in any respect or degree modified their efforts to advance this cause, would bear false witness against them."

We would ask Liberty party whether it would like to have this doctrine applied to Whig and Democratic parties. Let us see how the extract will read thus applied:—

"It is true that the leaders of Abolitionism in Cincinnati are connected with political parties which have not adopted anti-slavery ground; but the man who should say that this circumstance has ever abated their zeal in the cause of freedom, restrained or in any respect or degree modified their efforts to advance this cause, would bear false witness against them."

The Whigs and Democrats would doubtless be much pleased to have Liberty party preach this doctrine, as are the pro-slavery sects to have the Doctor's original. The views of the Philanthropist will of course commend themselves to all Liberty party men who wish to remain ecclesiastically pro-slavery; but "when the Devil gets the man, what will become of the Bishop?" We suppose we ought to reverse this saying, as Liberty party requires the man to be better as a man, than as a Bishop.

The absurd notion of being able to vote down slavery while you treat it in the church as christian, could only have originated in the brain of that party which as absurdly strives to prove a pro-slavery compact to be an anti-slavery Constitution, and its practice is truly laughable. A man asks Liberty party for votes. He wants to be surveyor or constable. It appears he is a Whig or a Democrat. He is not to be trusted, says Liberty party; let him leave his pro-slavery party and we will then give him an office, or try so. We admit he is a very good christian, properly qualified to be Deacon, or Elder, or even Minister of our Church, and if he wishes it, we will appoint him to any of these offices, but don't ask us to vote for him at the polls, for he is not fit either to mend a road or arrest a criminal.

If we judged from the testimony of actions, we should think that that party had no very exalted idea of christianity, inasmuch as the man whom it regards as a worthy teacher of its doctrines, drinking at the fount of inspiration, is considered unfit to receive the meaneast office in the gift of the politician.

Thomas W. Dorr.

A great deal of sympathy has been expressed for Thos. W. Dorr in consequence of his imprisonment which we are glad to say is terminated. It was contended by his friends that he was guilty of no crime, and therefore that his punishment was unjust and cruel. We do not intend to enquire whether the law under which he was condemned was cruel or humane, constitutional or unconstitutional, but merely to assert the fact, that if he was unjustly incarcerated, the millions who are grinding in the prison house of southern slavery are at least as unjustly imprisoned—that if he was cruelly treated, their condition is a thousand times worse—that if he was entitled to our sympathy, they have far greater claims to our commiseration.

Have the Democrats of our land so little sympathy

for those who are unjustly and cruelly treated, that one man absorbs it all? Why is it that hundreds of Democratic gatherings have sent forth resolutions expressing their sympathy with the Dorr of Rhode Island, and containing burning words of rebuke and condemnation for his oppressors; while the condition of millions of Dorrs in the South, and the conduct of the tyrants there, received not even a word of passing comment? It has been suggested to us that political capital could be made out of sympathy for Dorr, while sympathy for the slave yields no material from which can be manufactured such a fabric. Can this be the reason? Who will answer?

We see that Dorr refuses to take the oath of allegiance to the State; and why? Does he believe its government to be unjust and oppressive? We believe the government of the United States to be full as unjust and oppressive, arrogating to itself powers not derived from the consent of the governed," and giving in its Constitution "solemn guarantees"—as Webster calls them—to the system of slavery. Does he refuse because it is a usurpation of power? The United States government is as great a usurper; its Constitution opens with a lie, declaring it was ordained by "we the people" when one sixth of the people had not a single representative there, and the framers of the Constitution knew it. As well might Victoria and her ministers arrogate to themselves the title of "we the people" as for the framers of the Constitution to do under the circumstances which witnessed their assembling.

Our objections to taking the oath of allegiance to the U. States government are as well grounded as are Dorr's to swearing to support the Rhode Island State government, and we think them for stronger. Because of the stand we have thus taken we have been denounced as no government men: is Thos. W. Dorr a no government man? Who will answer?

"Liberty Herald."

We do not like to engage in unnecessary controversy, but when misrepresentations are made which are calculated to injuriously affect the cause we advocate, we feel called upon to notice them. Of such a character was the Herald's editorial notice of our anticipated meetings at Warren, in which the agents of the Am. Society were held up to the public as the representatives of the no government party in the East.—At the first meeting which they held there, they denied the charge, and stated that the editor, in what he said, manifested either a lack of honesty, or of intelligence. The history of the controversy between New and Old Organization was open to him, and if he could draw from that, or any other source, evidence to sustain his charge, why did he not produce it when demanded?

We would rather attribute his misrepresentation to ignorance, than to dishonesty; and had he promptly made the retraction when he found himself unable to prove his charge, no suspicion of dishonesty would have attached to him. The next No. of the Herald contained no allusion whatever to the matter; not a shadow of evidence to sustain his charge, not a word of explanation. The Editor doubtless thought the better way was to preserve a dignified silence, but unfortunately for himself, there were some who were not content with that mode of procedure, and one of those whom he had so grossly misrepresented, sent him the following note:—

MR. TAIT:—I have just seen the Herald of July 9th, and was much surprised to find that it contained no correction of the misstatement which was in your editorial of the previous number. You know the statement to which I refer—it was in substance that myself and associates were the agents or representatives of the no government party of abolitionists.—You may remember that we stated at our meeting in Warren, that the Editor who made the charge was either not sufficiently intelligent to conduct a paper, or else was dishonest; and we called upon you either to retract, and make the retraction as public as your charge, or else bring forward the proof upon which it was based, for the truth of the charge we utterly and unqualifiedly denied. You have done neither; and on behalf of myself and associates, we ask of you as an act of justice to ourselves and the society we represent—the Am. A. S. Society—to give this communication a conspicuous insertion; to record our denial of the charge, and our demand of proof or a prompt and explicit retraction. If you do not present the one, or make the other, the inference we draw from your conduct will be far from favorable, either to yourself personally or the cause your represent.

BENJ. S. JONES.

Instead of having the meanness and fairness to publish it as requested, he wrote an editorial on "Abby Kelley." In his first article he charged them with being opposed to Liberty party, with advocating a dissolution of the Union, and in favor of no-governmentism. The first two charges their lectures fully confirmed, and the last disproved. It was the last charge, and that alone, which in Warren they told him was false, and whose falsehood they re-asserted in the above letter. What folly then for him to talk about the first two, and by showing that the agents of the Am. Society were opposed to Liberty party, and in favor of Dissolution, try and win a character for